

Dear FEC:

I have specifically reviewed your proposed changes to the FECA because of BCRA, especially the definition of "Contribution." After review of both sides of the issue by reading excerpts of the Supreme Court cases, the applicable laws, and articles, it appears that the BCRA was enacted because of problems with campaign finance and the over-broad nature of the FECA. Is it possible that there were enough cries for action to put a stop to allowing campaigners and their staff to hide behind the First Amendment in financing campaigns? <?xml:namespace prefix = o ns = "urn:schemas-microsoft-com:office:office" />

Currently, the status of finance reform revolves around a relatively young independent regulatory agency using its power to do what it perceives as the appropriate actions to be taken, not what it is required to implement and carry out by Congress. But is the right thing to do the way the FEC interprets the First Amendment? Or, is the right thing to implement and carry out orders of Congress that are backed by Supreme Court decisions?

As a citizen, I am against the proposed regulations (ie reorganization), by the FEC.

Thank you for your time and consideration to this comment.

Cynthia Minchillo-Synhorst, RP

Board Certified Legal Assistant
Personal Injury Trial Law
Texas Board of Legal Specialization

Chat with friends online, try MSN Messenger: [Click Here](#)